

## REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-10 and 12-25 were rejected. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, 14-17, 21-22 and 25 have been amended, and new claim 26 has been added, leaving claims 1-26 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Claim Objections:***

Claims 2 and 18 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The Examiner states that all the generating devices have a light source.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection of claims 2 and 18. All light generating devices do not have a light source. For example, a prism or glass generates a second light by reflecting a first light, but it does not have a light source. Thus, the light generating means does not inherently have a light source. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection of claims 2 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7, 9-11, 16-17 and 21 were objected for informality.

Claims 5, 16 and 21 have been amended to change "V-shape" to "V shape".

Claim 7 has been amended to delete a couple of spaces between "value" and "of" in line 1.

Claim 9 has been amended to change "light source" to "light sources" in line 2.

Claim 10 has been amended to insert a space between "claim" and "8" in line 1; and to change "light source" to "light sources" in line 2.

Claim 11 has been amended to change "light source" to "light sources" in lines 4-5.

Claim 17 has been amended to delete "of the light" in the last line; and to insert "decreases" at the end of the claim.

The amendments of claims 5, 7, 9-11, 16-17 and 21 are suggested by the Examiner, and believed to be allowable. Thus, withdrawal of the objection of claims 5, 7, 9-11, 16-17 and 21 is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)***

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,664,862 to Redmond et al. (hereinafter “Redmond”) for the reasons stated on pages 3-6 of the Office Action.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Redmond, however, does not anticipate claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-13 and 15 for at least the reason described below.

***Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 12-13***

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, an illumination device comprising a light generating means for generating a light; a first light guiding means; and a second light guiding means, wherein widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully. Support for the amendment can be found on pages 10-12 of the specification.

Redmond is directed to an edge light for illuminating a lighting panel. Redmond provides a uniform distribution of light for illuminating the light panel by an elongated portion (33) having a planar surface (34) and a shaped surface (35). Redmond, however, does not disclose or teach to improve optical efficiency by defining the widths of the planar surface (34) and shaped surface (35) with respect to an amount of light input to the planar surface (34) and shaped surface (35). Thus, Redmond neither discloses nor teaches that widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Redmond. Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 12-13 depend from claim 1, thus include all the limitations of amended claim 1. It is thus believed that claims 2-4, 6-9 and 12-13 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

***Claim 15***

Claim 15 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, an illumination device comprising: a light generating means for generating a light; a first light guiding means; and a second light

guiding means, wherein the light generating means includes at least one first light source adjacent to the first side portion of the second light guiding means and at least one second light source adjacent to the second side portion of the second light guiding means, a first number of the first light sources being different from a second number of the second light sources; and wherein  $w1 : w2 = n1 : n2$ , wherein  $w1$  is a width of the first side portion, and  $w2$  is a width of the second side portion,  $n1$  is the first number of the first light sources, and  $n2$  is the second number of the second light sources.

Claim 15 has been amended to include the same elements as claim 11 which the Examiner states are allowable subject matter. Thus, claim 15 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Redmond.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his rejections on claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 5, 10, 14 and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmonde in view of one or more of U.S. Patent 3,838,909 to Fitzgibbons (hereinafter “Fitzgibbons”), U.S. Patent 3,761,704 to Takeichi et al. (hereinafter “Takeichi”), U.S. Patent 5,442,522 to Kalmanash (hereinafter “Kalmanash”), and U.S. Patent 5,055,978 to Rogoff (hereinafter “Rogoff”) for the reasons stated on pages 6-11 of the Office Action.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). However, any of the cited references in individual or combination, does not render obvious claims 5, 10, 14 and 16-25 and new claim 26 for at least the reason described below.

Claims 5, 10 and 14

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Takeichi.

Takeichi is directed to a dial illuminating device comprising a light converting member consisting of two transparent light converting elements in the form of trapezoids. Takeichi, however, neither suggests nor teaches the element: widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 1. As mentioned above for the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Redmond fails to teach or suggest the invention of claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Redmond and Takeichi does not render obvious claim 1. Claim 5 depends from claim 1, and thus, is believed to be allowable.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Kalmanash.

Kalmanash is directed to a backlight system having a dual lighting system for day viewing and night viewing in which fluorescent backlighting lamps (42) are only illuminated during day viewing, and an edge lighting night lamp (50) is only illuminated during night viewing (See, col. 4, ll. 3-7 of Kalmanash). The backlight system of Kalmanash does not focus on the optical efficiency of the light emitted from light sources disposed at first and second side portions. That is, Kalmanash neither teaches nor suggests the element: widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Redmond and Kalmanash does not render obvious claim 1, because any of Redmond and Kalmanash does not teach or suggest that widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 1. Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and thus, is believed to be allowable.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Rogoff.

Rogoff is directed to a light source for directing light from a lamp to a substantially flat light emitting surface. Rogoff neither teaches nor suggests the element: wherein widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Redmond and Rogoff does not render obvious claim 1, because any of Redmond and Rogoff does not suggest or teach that widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 1. Claim 14 depends from claim 1, and thus, is believed to be allowable.

#### Claim 16

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Takeichi.

As mentioned above for the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the combination of Redmond and Takeichi fails to teach or suggest the element: wherein the light generating means includes at least one first light source adjacent to the first side portion of the second light guiding means and at least one second light source adjacent to the second side portion of the second light guiding means, a first number of the first light sources being different from a second number of the second light sources; and wherein  $w1 : w2 = n1 : n2$ , wherein  $w1$  is a width of the first side portion, and  $w2$  is a width of the second side portion,  $n1$  is the first number of the first light sources, and  $n2$  is the second number of the second light sources, as claimed in claim 15. Thus, the combination of Redmond and Takeichi does not render obvious claim 15. Claim 16 depends from claim 15, and is believed to be allowable.

#### Claims 17-25

Claims 17-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Fitzgibbons.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a reflection type liquid crystal display device including a liquid crystal display panel for displaying an image, and an illumination device disposed in a front of the liquid crystal display panel, the illumination device comprising: a light generating means for generating a light; a first light guiding means; and a second light guiding means, wherein widths of the first and second side

portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully. Support for the amendment can be found on pages 10-12 of the specification.

Fitzgibbons is directed to an ambient illuminations system in which illumination of a transmissive display by means of external ambient light is provided by mounting prism to the rear of the back plate. Fitzgibbons neither teaches nor suggests that widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 17.

The combination of Redmond and Fitzgibbons does not render obvious claim 17, because neither of Redmond and Fitzgibbons teaches nor suggests the element: widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 17.

Claims 18-20 and 22-24 depend from claim 17, thus include all the limitations of amended claim 17. It is thus believed that claims 18-20 and 22-24 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 17, which is believed to be allowable.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Fitzgibbons, and further in view of Takeichi.

Any of Redmond, Fitzgibbons and Takeichi does not teach or suggest that widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 17. Thus, claim 17 is allowable over the combination of Redmond, Fitzgibbons, and Takeichi. Claim 21 depends from claim 17, and thus is believed to allowable.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Fitzgibbons, and further in view of Rogoff.

Any of Redmond, Fitzgibbons and Rogoff does not teach or suggest that widths of the first and second side portions are defined according to an amount of the light input to the first and second side portions, respectfully, as claimed in claim 17. Thus, claim 17 is allowable over the combination of Redmond, Fitzgibbons, and Rogoff. Claim 21 depends from claim 17, and thus is believed to allowable.

New claim 26 depends from claim 17, and thus includes all the limitation of amended claim 17. It is thus believed that new claim 26 is allowable for at least the reasons

given for claim 1 over Redmond, Fitzgibbons, Takeichi or Rogoff in individual or combination, which is believed to be allowable.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,  
KEUN-WOO LEE ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By: \_\_\_\_\_

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: June 18, 2003